

Last week, in the early hours of Friday morning, the Senate passed a budget resolution that will pave the way for President Biden's American Rescue Plan. As promised, the Senate held an open, bipartisan, and vigorous amendment process. Several bipartisan amendments passed with overwhelming majorities and were added to the resolution. The fact that the debate went all night and only concluded at around 5:30 in the morning is a testament to the vigor of the amendment process, which, again, I note, was bipartisan. The first amendment, in fact—a very important one by the Senator from Arizona, Ms. SINEMA, and the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. WICKER—helped our restaurant industry, and it was bipartisan.

Now, our Senate committees have instructions to begin crafting legislation to rescue our country from COVID-19; to speed vaccination distribution; provide a lifeline to small businesses; help schools reopen safely; save the jobs of teachers, firefighters, and other public employees; and support every American who is struggling to put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads.

This important, historic work will give hundreds of millions of Americans the relief they need while getting our country back to normal as quickly as possible.

#### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. President, now, on impeachment, tomorrow, the second impeachment trial of Donald J. Trump will commence, only the fourth trial of a President or former President in American history and the first trial for any public official who has been impeached twice.

For the information of the Senate, the Republican leader and I, in consultation with both the House managers and former-President Trump's lawyers, have agreed to a bipartisan resolution to govern the structure and timing of the impending trial. Let me say that again. All parties have agreed to a structure that will ensure a fair and honest Senate impeachment trial of the former President.

Each side will have ample time to make their arguments: 16 hours over 2 days for the House managers, the same for the former President's counsel. If managers decide they want witnesses, there will be a vote on that, which is the option they requested in regard to witnesses.

The trial will also accommodate a request from the former President's counsel to pause the trial during the Sabbath. The trial will break on Friday afternoon before sundown and will not resume until Sunday afternoon.

As in previous trials, there will be equal time for Senators' questions and for closing arguments and an opportunity for the Senate to hold deliberations, if it so chooses.

And then we will vote on the Article of Impeachment. If the former President is convicted, we will proceed to a

vote on whether he is qualified to enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

The structure we have agreed to is eminently fair. It will allow for the trial to achieve its purpose: truth and accountability. That is what trials are designed to do: to arrive at the truth of the matter and render a verdict. And following the despicable attack on January 6, there must be truth and accountability if we are going to move forward, heal, and bring our country together once again. Sweeping something as momentous as this under the rug brings no healing whatsoever. Let's be clear about that.

Now, as the trial begins, the forces aligned with the former President are preparing to argue that the trial itself is unconstitutional because Donald Trump is no longer in office, relying on a fringe legal theory that has been roundly debunked by constitutional scholars from across the political spectrum.

Just yesterday, another very prominent, conservative, Republican constitutional lawyer, Chuck Cooper, wrote in the Wall Street Journal that Republicans are dead wrong if they think an impeachment trial of a former President is unconstitutional.

Here is what he wrote:

Given that the Constitution permits the Senate to impose the penalty of permanent disqualification only on former officeholders, it defies logic to suggest that the Senate is prohibited from trying and convicting former officeholders. The Senators who supported Mr. Paul's motion should reconsider their view and judge the former president's misconduct on the merits.

That is no liberal. That is Chuck Cooper, a lawyer who represented House Republicans in a lawsuit against Speaker PELOSI, a former adviser to Senator CRUZ's Presidential campaign, driving a stake into the central argument we are going to hear from the former President's counsel.

Now, I understand why this fringe constitutional theory is being advanced. For the past few weeks, the political right has been searching for a safe harbor, a way to oppose the conviction of Donald Trump without passing judgment on his conduct; to avoid alienating the former President's supporters without condoning his, obviously, despicable, unpatriotic, undemocratic behavior. But the truth is no such safe harbor exists. The trial is clearly constitutional by every frame of analysis—by constitutional text, historical practice, Senate precedent, and basic common sense.

Presidents cannot simply resign to avoid accountability for an impeachable offense nor can they escape judgment by waiting until their final few weeks in office to betray our country. The impeachment powers assigned to the Congress by the Constitution cannot be defeated by a President who decides to run away or trashes our democracy on the way out the door. This trial will confirm that fact.

The merits of the case against the former President will be presented, and

the former President's counsel will mount a defense. Ultimately, Senators will decide on the one true question at stake in this trial: Is Donald Trump guilty of inciting a violent mob against the United States, a mob whose purpose was to interfere with the constitutional process of counting electoral votes and ensuring a peaceful transfer of power? And, if he is guilty, does someone who would commit such a high crime against his own country deserve to hold any office of honor or trust ever again?

Consistent with the solemn oath we have all taken to "do impartial justice according to the Constitution and laws" of the United States, that is the question every Senator must answer in this trial.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, first, briefly, I am pleased that Leader SCHUMER and I were able to reach an agreement on a fair process and estimated timeline for the upcoming Senate trial.

This structure has been approved by both former President Trump's legal team and the House managers because it preserves due process and the rights of both sides. It will give Senators, as jurors, ample time to review the case and the arguments that each side will present.

#### REMEMBERING GEORGE SHULTZ

Madam President, on a completely different matter, on Saturday, we lost a great statesman and scholar who gave more than 80 of his 100 years to his country.

George Shultz's service began in the U.S. Marine Corps. From the beaches of Palau, he was among the Americans who helped retake the Pacific from Japan. Back home, he earned a Ph.D. in economics. He taught at MIT and would later helm the University of Chicago's Graduate Business School. But public service beckoned, and George Shultz began a decades-long run of ping-ponging prolifically between academia and top government posts.

The first of three Presidents who would benefit from his expert counsel, Dwight Eisenhower, hired him as a senior staff economist back in 1955. A decade and a half later, he was back, this time as President Nixon's Secretary of Labor, where he worked on desegregation and, later, as OMB Director. Then, at a pivotal moment for the U.S. and world economies, George Shultz was tapped to lead the Treasury Department. He fought inflation and worked

to modernize our monetary policy so American leaders could control America's destiny.

After an interlude in the private sector, Secretary Shultz's country came calling again. He spent 6½ of President Reagan's 8 years as Secretary of State. He helped steer the smart and strong foreign policy that clinched the free world's victory over the Soviet Union, but even as the Reagan administration nudged communism into a box canyon, this top diplomat's master touch was vital in making sure that tensions did not rise too high.

As amazing as it sounds, this impressive resume doesn't fully explain George Shultz's incredible reputation. It wasn't just all he did. It was how he did it. He led with thoughtfulness, fairness, and, above all, integrity. He lived by the maxim he shared in his centennial reflection just a few weeks ago.

Here is what he said:

Trust is the coin of the realm.

His honesty and thoughtfulness won wide admiration that transcended politics. He won the trust of career diplomats and State Department staff, including those who did not naturally lean to the Reagan right.

Famously, when new Ambassadors met with him on their way abroad, the Secretary would spin a globe and ask them to point out "their country." The unlucky ones who fell for the trap and pointed to their foreign destinations were swiftly corrected. "No," he said. "Your country is always America."

At the McConnell Center at the University of Louisville, we host a distinguished speaker series. George Shultz honored us as our very first ever distinguished speaker back in 1993, and he kept right on writing and speaking and mentoring young people up until just a few weeks ago.

America was his country, all right. He loved it deeply and served it always. The Senate's prayers are with the Shultz family and all the friends and colleagues he leaves behind, a truly remarkable life.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, in 2020, a Republican Senate and a Republican administration led five historic pandemic rescue packages on a completely bipartisan basis.

We marshaled the largest Federal response to any crisis since World War II—about \$4 trillion across five bills—all of it completely bipartisan, but now Washington Democrats have other ideas. Even though we are still pushing out \$900 billion in relief that Congress passed less than 2 months ago, even though a group of Senate Republicans met with President Biden to discuss bipartisan avenues for hundreds of billions of dollars more, Washington Democrats have decided they want to go it alone.

It was last March—remember?—when a senior House Democrat called this disaster a "tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit our vision."

Americans are suffering, but their side seems to see an opportunity to ram through ideological change. That is the impulse behind the Democrats' latest \$1.9 trillion proposal. Their plan for more massive borrowing puts leftwing myths ahead of the scientific evidence and the Nation's urgent needs. While the Biden administration's own scientists say schools could reopen safely right now with smart and simple precautions, their proposal buys into the myth from Big Labor that schools should stay shut a whole lot longer.

While Republicans want to save as many jobs as possible, Washington Democrats are backing Senator SANDERS' demand to more than double the minimum wage. The Congressional Budget Office says this would kill 1.4 million American jobs. Nonpartisan experts say it would send more people to the unemployment line than it would lift out of poverty. But remember, this is all about liberal dreams, not urgent needs.

Some Democrats even want to break Senate rules to jam this through. Last week, the Senate had a 14-hour voting marathon on amendments to the phony, partisan budget that Democrats jammed through as a procedural first step. We got Senators on the record on a host of questions that matter to American families. Sadly, the Democrats blocked our efforts to say that, at the very least, school districts where teachers have been vaccinated certainly need to reopen, to press States to accurately report nursing home deaths, to protect the free exercise of religion, and several more.

Other amendments divided Democrats and were adopted. For example, over some Democrats' objections, the Senate said that illegal immigrants should not receive stimulus checks, that the Keystone XL Pipeline should not be canceled, and that our government should not declare war on fracking. But, amazingly enough, at the end of the night, the very same Senate Democrats who had sought to appear moderate by supporting those three things turned around and voted in lockstep to strip them all out again. Our colleagues who said they supported these changes voted to strip them right back out at the end of the evening. That is about as Washington, DC, as it gets.

For the sake of America's kids, American jobs, Americans' health, Democrats should put the political games aside and resume the same kinds of bipartisan talks they demanded constantly all of last year. American families deserve a process and a bill that put their actual needs at the center.

#### BURMA

Now, Madam President, on one final matter, over the weekend, hundreds of thousands of protesters stood up across Burma in defiance of the military coup.

For a week now, the military has detained hundreds of civil society leaders and democratically elected officials,

some on mysterious or obviously specious charges and others without any charge at all. Their actions were illegitimate right from the start, and the treatment of these political prisoners is showing the world the military regime's disdain for the rule of law.

In the face of this tyranny and with the memory of how brutally the military has dealt with protesters in the past, the public unity of so many of Burma's people is a powerful display of courage. In far-flung cities and towns, members of the country's diverse ethnic groups, from the Burman majority to the Shan and Rohingya minorities, have rallied around the democratically elected government. They are demanding justice and an end to military rule.

I have been encouraged over the past week by the diplomatic efforts undertaken by the administration to demonstrate the U.S. condemnation of the military's flagrant assault on political rights. Today, it is time to follow up with meaningful costs on those who aid and abet the suffocation of Burmese democracy.

The people of Burma in the streets today are putting their lives on the line. As one protestor told the New York Times over the weekend, "I don't care if they shoot because under the military, our lives will be dead anyway."

Today, these protestors are joining in the same refrain heard repeatedly in places like Hong Kong, where democratic progress is too often met with jackboots. They are standing up for basic freedoms, and they are paying close attention to who will stand with them.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NEW START TREATY

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss the administration's decision to extend the New START treaty by 5 years.

Supporters hailed the move, with the New York Times reporting that the President's decision "avoided a renewed arms race." Meanwhile, critics, who believed the question of extension had given the United States leverage to extract concessions from Russia, as well as China, described the move as a wasted opportunity and a giveaway to Putin.

As the last bilateral arms control agreement between the United States and Russia, perhaps it shouldn't be surprising that the debate over extending New START took on outsized importance, with parties on both sides seeing it as the vehicle to accomplish all of their goals. Now, with the extension decided, it comes with an opportunity to regain our perspective and consider